



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,476	02/22/2002	Graeme John Proudler	30007644-2	8509

22879 7590 08/13/2010  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
3404 E. Harmony Road  
Mail Stop 35  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528

EXAMINER
----------

TRUONG, THANHNGA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2438

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

08/13/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM  
ipa.mail@hp.com  
laura.m.clark@hp.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/080,476	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PROUDLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> THANHNGA B. TRUONG	<b>Art Unit</b> 2438	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on May 19, 2010. Claims 11-30 are pending. Claims 27-30 are newly added by the applicant. At this time claims 11-30 are still rejected.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed May 19, 2010, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 11, 13-22, 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Stewart et al (US 6,414,635 B1), have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Stewart et al (US 6,414,635 B1) and further in view of Hay et al (US 2002/0089528).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 11, 13-22, 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al (US 6,414,635 B1), and further in view of Hay et al (US 2002/0089528).

a. *Referring to claim 11:*

i. Stewart teaches an information system comprising:

(1) an information access point relating to at least one pre-determined geographical area, said information access point including apparatus for retrieving information relating to trusted computing platforms located within said pre-determined geographical area (**see Figures 1-3, column 2, lines 54-66; column 3, lines 6-32; and column 8, lines 9-12 of Stewart**), said information system being

Art Unit: 2438

arranged to provide said information to a portable computing apparatus visiting the pre-determined geographical area, wherein said information enables interaction with trusted components of said trusted computing platforms (**column 8, lines 9-23; column 16, lines 1-4 of Stewart**).

ii. Although Stewart teaches an information system using access point with related pre-determined geographical area for network communication wherein the portable computing device (PCD) 110 equipped with a certificate to ensure security, Stewart does imply the teaching on the capability of communicating with trusted computing platform. However, Hay teaches this limitation in **paragraph [0022] of Hay**.

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified the invention of Stewart to clearly state the portable computing device (PCD) 110 is the trusted computing platform and/or modified Stewart's invention with the teaching of Hay for a user of a computer system to feel confident that they know who and what they are talking to, that the communication is confidential and that the information is transmitted accurately (paragraph [0001] of Hay).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified the invention of Stewart to clearly state the portable computing device (PCD) 110 is the trusted computing platform and/or modified Stewart's invention with the teaching of Hay for securing transmitting information over the network.

b. Referring to claim 13:

i. The combination of teaching between Stewart and Hay teaches the claimed subject matter. Stewart further teaches:

(1) wherein said information access point comprises a trusted computing platform (**see Figure 1, column 7, lines 15-31 of Stewart**).

c. Referring to claim 14:

i. The combination of teaching between Stewart and Hay teaches the claimed subject matter. Stewart further teaches:

(1) comprising apparatus for communicating or interacting with a the portable computing apparatus (**see Figure 1, column 7, lines 15-31 of Stewart**).

d. Referring to claim 15:

i. The combination of teaching between Stewart and Hay teaches the claimed subject matter. Stewart further teaches:

(1) wherein said apparatus for communicating or interacting a the portable computing apparatus is arranged to perform said communication or interaction by physical contact or directional wireless communication (**see Figure 1, column 7, lines 15-31 of Stewart**).

e. Referring to claims 16-17:

i. The combination of teaching between Stewart and Hay teaches the claimed subject matter. Stewart further teaches:

(1) incorporating or accompanied by a declaration (e.g. certificate) concerning the trustworthiness of the system; wherein said declaration is capable of interpretation by a user of the portable computing apparatus without preprocessing by an information processing system (**column 8, lines 9-12 and lines 55-64 of Stewart**).

f. Referring to claim 18:

i. The combination of teaching between Stewart and Hay teaches the claimed subject matter. Stewart further teaches:

(1) arranged to verify the identity of a user (**column 8, lines 9-12 and lines 55-64 of Stewart**).

g. Referring to claim 19:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 15, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 15 above.

h. Referring to claim 20:

i. The combination of teaching between Stewart and Hay teaches the claimed subject matter. Stewart further teaches:

(1) wherein the information provided to the portable computing apparatus includes security attributes of the trusted computing platform within said pre-determined geographical area (**column 8, lines 9-12 and lines 55-64 of Stewart**).

i. Referring to claims 21-22, 24-26:

i. These claims consist a method to implement claim 11, 13-15, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 11, 13-15 above.

j. Referring to claim 27:

i. The combination of teaching between Stewart and Hay teaches the claimed subject matter. Hay further teaches:

(1) the portable computing apparatus requesting that a verification service verify the information; the verification service verifying identities of the trusted computing platforms, signing results, and returning signed results; and the portable computing apparatus using the signed results to identify which of the trusted computing platforms can be trusted (**paragraph [0045, 0048, 0056] of Hay**).

k. Referring to claim 28:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 11, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 11 above.

l. Referring to claim 29:

i. The combination of teaching between Stewart and Hay teaches the claimed subject matter. Stewart and Hay further teache:

(1) wherein the interface comprises at least one of a contact reader and a directional wireless communication interface through which the

Art Unit: 2438

portable computing apparatus can communicate with the information access point **(column 1, lines 30-40 of Stewart; and paragraphs [0012-0015] of Hay).**

I. Referring to claim 30:

i. The combination of teaching between Stewart and Hay teaches the claimed subject matter. Hay further teaches:

(1) wherein the information includes public keys associated with the trusted computing platforms **(paragraphs [0048, 0050, and 0057] of Hay).**

5. Claims 12 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al (US 6,414,635 B1), in view of Hay et al (US 2002/0089528), further in view of Gennaro et al (5,927,066).

a. Referring to claims 12 and 23:

i. Although the combination of teaching between Stewart and Hay teaches the claimed subject matter, they do not clearly show wherein said information system is arranged to provide as said information only details and/or a list of public keys of genuine trusted computing platforms within said pre-determined geographical area **(column 8, lines 9-12 of Stewart)**.. On the other hand, Gennaro teaches this limitation in column 27, lines 27-31 of Gennaro.

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified the invention of Stewart with the teaching of Gennaro for establishing keys between communicating parties **(column 1, lines 9-10 of Gennaro).**

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified the invention of Stewart with the teaching of Gennaro to enhance wireless network security.

**Conclusion**

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2438

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Taghi Arani can be reached at 571-272-3787. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

/Thanhnga B. Truong/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2438

TBT

August 9, 2010



Application/Control Number: 10/080,476  
Art Unit: 2438

Page 8